

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Brossman et al.

Application No.: 10/065,526

Group No.: 2625

Filed: 25 October 2002

Examiner: J. Rohwer

Title: METHOD, APPARATUS AND PROGRAM PRODUCT  
FOR DEVICE INDEPENDENT PRINT JOB TICKETING

### TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SUMMARY

*Applicants submit this telephone interview summary to meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), and according to the requirements listed in MPEP § 713.04.*

Date/Type of Interview: telephone interview conducted on 26 January 2007

Examiner: J. Rohwer

Name of Applicants' attorney: M. Gratton

Exhibits shown or demonstrations conducted: None

Claims discussed: 1

Prior art discussed: Schwarz (U.S. Patent 6,476,927) & Shaw (U.S. Patent 5,604,843)

General thrust of Examiner's arguments: see below

General thrust of Applicants' arguments: see below

Agreement reached and general nature of the agreement: see below

Proposed amendments: see below

Other pertinent matters:

Applicants' undersigned attorney, Applicants' attorney Dan Fishman, the Examiner and his supervisor discussed various aspects of the method and apparatus in the rejected claims. Applicants' undersigned explained the apparatus of the present application and the differences between the present claims and the Shaw and Schwarz references.

Specifically, Applicants' undersigned attorney explained the difference between a print source file and a job ticket as recited by the claims. As used in the claims, a print source file refers to the actual image and/or text output printed onto paper (e.g., an image of a patent application). By contrast, a job ticket stores information relating to printer options regarding the printing of the print source file (e.g., color of paper, duplexing, stapling, etc.). The job ticket stores the printer options in a device independent format, and the apparatus of the present claims uses a mapping of the device independent representation of the printer options to convert the printer options into device specific commands.

Applicants' attorney explained how Shaw does not show the converting of print options, but rather the converting of a print source file. In light of this discussion, the Examiner suggested that the Applicants' file a response clarifying this distinction, and that the rejection based on the Shaw reference would be withdrawn in light of this distinction.

Date: 6 February 2007



---

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Max Gratton, Reg. No. 56,541  
Attorney for Applicant and Assignee  
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP  
Telephone: (303) 786-7687  
Facsimile: (303) 786-7691